

## REMARKS

Claims 1-27, 51-77, and 101-127 are pending in the above-referenced application. Claims 1-27, 51-77 and 101-127 are rejected. The drawings filed on November 9, 2000 are objected to.

In particular, and in accordance with the item numbering therein, the Office Action has:

In Item 1, acknowledged Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-27, 51-77, and 101-127 (Group I) in the reply of September 28, 2005. Group I claims are those drawn to using an HTTP URL associated with an entity to facilitate communication with the entity; Group II claims are those drawn to using a polling technique to check on-line status of an entity; and Group III claims are those drawn to sending messages between entities using HTTP connection.

In Item 3, indicated that the title of the invention is not descriptive and that a new title is needed that is indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants have submitted a new title;

In Item 4, indicated that corrected drawings are needed. Applicants have filed newly drafted drawings with this response;

In Items 5 and 6, rejected claims 1-27, 51-77 and 101-127 as being anticipated by Oliver (US 2002/0133412) under 35 USC 102(e);

In Item 7, rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by Oliver;

In Item 8, rejected claims 2-4, as being anticipated by Oliver;

In Item 9, rejected claims 5-7, as being anticipated by Oliver;

In Item 10, rejected claims 8-9, as being anticipated by Oliver;

In Item 11, rejected claim 10 as being anticipated by Oliver;

In Item 12, rejected claim 11 as being anticipated by Oliver; and

In item 13, rejected claims 12-27, 51-77, and 101-127 as being anticipated by Oliver under the rationale provided for the corresponding claims in 1-27.

Applicants have cancelled the pending claims in the application and added new claims 151-157 to more clearly define the invention. Independent claim 151 is directed to a method of establishing and maintaining an on-line presence. Applicants respectfully submit that the Oliver reference fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 151. Specifically, the Oliver reference fails to teach the limitation “if the request is validated, sending a Web page to the user computer, said Web page containing an applet and an assigned unique session ID number,” the limitation “upon receipt of the HTTP request, making a TCP/IP open socket request to obtain an open socket for communication with the user machine,” the limitation “said applet using the HTTP request to maintain a virtual continuous HTTP connection with the server,” and the limitation “updating a group table that tracks groups of on-line users to reflect the on-line presence of the new user.”

Oliver fails to teach the limitation “if the request is validated, sending a Web page to the user computer, said Web page containing an applet and an assigned unique session ID number,” because Oliver specifically states that no change to the browser is needed. Oliver ‘412, paragraph 0086. Applicants’ applet alters the functionality of the browser and does so in a specific way described below.

Oliver further fails to teach the limitation “upon receipt of the HTTP request, making a TCP/IP open socket request to obtain an open socket for communication with the user machine,” because Oliver teaches away from using TCP. Specifically, Oliver teaches the use of UDP instead. Oliver ‘412, paragraph 0235, “all protocol operations require the use of 2 UDP/IP datagrams.” The Oliver reference also fails to teach the use of an open socket for communication with the user machine. Oliver specifically states that the client side of TVS uses the socket system call to assure that only packets coming from its TVS server are accepted. However, the client side of TVS is not the user machine of the present invention. The client side of TVS includes components that are on the server side of a client/server system. The client side of TVS includes components that are not provided by Clickshare. Oliver ‘412, paragraph 0128.

Oliver does not teach the limitation “said applet using the HTTP request to maintain a virtual continuous HTTP connection with the server,” because Oliver has no

concept of creating and maintaining a continuous HTTP connection between a client and a server. Though Oliver mentions the use of the standard, non-persistent HTTP protocol, it is only for the purpose of delivery or return of the Authentication Token. Thereafter, the system in Oliver reverts to the TVS protocol, which is written using the User Datagram Protocol. Oliver '412, paragraphs 0233 and 0242. There is no mention in Oliver of creating a persistent connection using the HTTP protocol. In Applicants' invention, the applet maintains a virtual continuous HTTP connection with the session manager server. No such condition obtains in the Oliver reference.

Oliver additionally fails to teach "updating a group table that tracks groups of on-line users to reflect the on-line presence of the new user," because the Oliver reference has no concept of groups of on-line users.

Therefore, the Oliver reference fails to describe the limitations of claim 151.

Regarding claim 152, Applicants submit that this claim is allowable over the reference at least because it depends from claim 151 which is allowable. Additionally, the Oliver reference fails to describe the limitation "wherein the user table includes a socket file descriptor of the HTTP connection for the user, a counter used to keep the connection open, and a set of dynamic session information that includes an IP address identifying the user machine, an IP address of an entity that maintains the socket and the HTTP connection with the user machine, a TCP port number, the assigned session ID, a list of groups to which the user belongs, and a group that is displayed on the user machine as the active group," at least because the reference at least fails to describe the presence of the socket file descriptor of the HTTP connection for the user in the user table.

Regarding claim 153, Applicants submit that this claim is allowable over the reference at least because it depends from claim 151 which is allowable. Additionally, the reference fails to describe the limitation "wherein said group table includes a list of groups that have users currently on-line and a list of members in each group that are currently on-line," because the reference has no concept of a group table and no concept of keeping track the groups that have users currently on-line.

Regarding claim 154, Applicants submit that this claim is allowable over the reference at least because it depends from claim 151 which is allowable. Additionally, the

reference fails to describe the limitation “wherein the step of obtaining the open socket is performed by an alternate socket handler, said alternate socket handler obtaining the open socket without creating a new thread of execution at the server.” The Oliver reference never contemplates the improvement of maintaining open sockets without creating a new thread for each socket. In fact, the Oliver reference even suggests that there will be a limitation on the number of “clients” that can be served. Oliver 412, paragraph 0267. This is the reason, in Applicants’ invention for using the alternate socket handler. Therefore, Oliver fails to describe the limitation of claim 154.

Regarding claim 155, Applicants submit that this claim is allowable over the reference at least because claim 154 from which claim 155 depends is allowable. Additionally, claim 155 is allowable because the reference fails to teach the limitation “wherein the socket is stored in a socket table at the server, said socket having a file descriptor by which said socket is referenced; and wherein the alternate socket handler accesses the socket by referencing its file descriptor,” because the reference fails to contemplate the use of an alternate socket handler or one that avoids adding threads by referencing the socket file descriptor.

Regarding claims 156 and 156, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for the same reasons that claim 151 is allowable, as each of the claims contain similar limitations.

**CONCLUSION**

Having addressed all of the rejections, Applicants believe that the application is in condition for prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 21, 2006



Anthony B. Diepenbrock III  
Reg. No. 39,960

DECHERT LLP  
Customer No. 37509  
Tel: 650. 813.4800

**CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION (EFS)**

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION BY ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM (EFS-WEB): I certify that I am working under the authority of the certificate holder that this correspondence (and all attachments listed) is being electronically filed with the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: June 21, 2006



Yvette Y. Turande-Owen